



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,266	09/30/2003	Kenneth Joseph Burger	ROC920030304US1	6175
7590		09/06/2007		
Grant A. Johnson				
IBM Corporation				
Dept. 917				
3605 Highway 52 North				
Rochester, MN 55901-7829				
			EXAMINER	
			BELL, CORY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/675,266	Applicant(s) BURGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Cory C. Bell	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-11, 14-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-11, 14-16, and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-16, and 18-20 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with regard to the lack of teaching a sort rule are not persuasive as Group By is a sort rule. The MY SQL 5.0 Reference Manual section on Group By has been provided, as evidence that the GROUP BY command is a sort rule.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes in view of the Open Directory Project and The Open Directory Project Terms of Use.

4. **Claim 1** is rejected as Barnes Teaches:

Requesting a plurality of records from the one of the one or more information suppliers;(Col 10 lines 22-23, Col 4 lines 55-56)

Art Unit: 2164

selecting a subset of a plurality of characteristics from a plurality of records based on a model norm(Figure 5);

preparing a report with the subset(Figure 6, col 9 lines 39-46)

ordering the subset of the plurality of characteristics in the report based on a

relative significance of the characteristics in the model norm. wherein the relative

significance specifies a different order of the characteristics than the records'. (Col 10 lines 42-51, Col 2 lines 43-46 shows that the order the rows, or characteristics, order as a record inside a database is arbitrary, therefore it is inherent that the defined order is different from an arbitrary order.)

ordering the plurality of records in the report based on a sort rule in the model

norm(Figure 5)

receiving a favored norm from one of the plurality of information providers of a selected record

in the report(Col 9 lines 63-67, Col 10 line 56 – Col 11 line 2, Col 10 lines 24-29 expressly discloses the report templates being stored at the information provider)

selecting a second subset of the plurality of characteristics from the plurality of

Records. wherein the favored norm specifies the second subset(Figure 8) and

creating a second report with the second subset(Figure 9).

However Barnes fails to expressly disclose:

registering a plurality of information suppliers and a plurality of area of interest associated with the plurality of respective information suppliers

finding one of the plurality of areas of interest associated with one of the plurality of information suppliers that matches a field of interest requested by a client

Art Unit: 2164

This limitations however were well known in the art at the time of the invention as the claim a directory type search engine, and thus are taught in the provided pages from the Open Directory Project Web Page. Barnes also discloses creating a model norm based on a data dictionary (in figure 4 and Col 12 lines 22-25), but fails to expressly disclose the format being standardized by an agreement among the plurality of information suppliers. This feature is taught by the use of the Open Directory Project in the terms of use page 4, which states “ You acknowledge that Netscape and the ODP staff have unfettered editorial discretion to determine the structure and content of the ODP” And the first paragraph shows that all information suppliers must agree to these terms in order to be part of the project. Last, it is noted the Open Directory Project has only one structure at a time and is thus uniform and standardized for all users. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features as it allows user to quickly search for desired data.

5. **Claim 4** is rejected for the following reasons:

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the preparing the report further comprises: preparing extra characteristics not in the subset in a least-significant column of the report as a sequence of name-value pairs (*Barnes, Col 10 lines 42-51, the ability to drill into individual records, retrieving the record*).

6. **Claim 5** is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the preparing extra characteristics further comprises: ordering the name-value pairs based on a relative significance in a favored norm(*Figure 8*).

7. **Claim 6** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claims 1 rejection.

8. **Claim 7** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 4 rejection

9. **Claim 8** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 5 rejection

10. **Claim 10** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 1 rejection

11. **Claim 11** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 1 rejection.

12. **Claim 14** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 5 rejection.

13. **Claim 15** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Figure 8 "Group By".

14. **Claim 16** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 1 rejection.

15. **Claim 18** is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

See Claim 5 and 1 rejections.

16. **Claim 19** is rejected for the following reasons:

See Claim 15 rejection.

17. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes in view of the Open Directory Project and US 5603025, known hereafter as Tabb.

18. **Claim 9** is rejected for the following reasons:

19. Barnes teaches the claims upon which claim 9 is dependent, as well as the ability for users to be able to drill down into more data, but did not expressly disclose there being an indicator that there is more information on the record. However, this is taught in Col 20 lines 28-47 of Tabb. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to include this feature as it allows users to quickly identify paths to more data.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes in further view of the Open directory Project and "Default Value" known hereafter as Pearson.

20. **Claim 20** is rejected for the following reasons:

Barnes teaches the claim upon which claim 20 is dependant, but fails to teach a default value being defined in the model norm, this is taught in Pearson however. Which teaches defining default values for views(or models) of database tables. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to define default values in the normalization for a view, or model, as it make the "default value visible to (the) user in data entry forms".

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER